

## REMARKS

In the Office Action identified above, the Examiner rejected claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter; and rejected claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Olson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,566,333).

By this amendment, Applicants have amended claims 1-3, 5-7, and 12 and have cancelled claim 11 without prejudice. Claims 1-10 and 12-15 are pending. Based on the following arguments, Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101 and 102(b).

### **I. The Rejection of Claims 1-5 Under 35 U.S.C. § 101**

Claims 1-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. However, to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended claims 1-3 and 5. Support for these amendments are provided in the specification at, for example, page 7, line 25-page 8, line 9. Applicants submit that claims 1-5 fully meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 101. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

### **II. The Rejection of Claims 1-15 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Olson et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

In order to support a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), each and every element as set forth in the claims must be found, either expressly or inherently described, in a

single prior art reference. M.P.E.P. § 2131. Olson et al. fails to teach each and every recitation of claims 1-15.

Claim 1 recites “[a]n information display method applied to an information management system for managing a plurality of jobs, including *inter alia*, “acquiring the plurality of information items from the storage unit, classifying information contained in the acquired plurality of information items with reference to the designated attribute and displaying the classified information on a screen of a display unit.” Olson et al. teaches a user interface that allows a user to enter and modify hierarchal structural relationships and the like with respect to a database. See Olson et al., col. 7, lines 38-43. Further, Olson et al. teaches that such information items are stored in form of flat data files such as ASCII files. See Olson et al., col. 6, lines 65-66. However, Olson et al. does not teach or suggest at least the step of “acquiring the plurality of information items from the storage unit, classifying information contained in the acquired plurality of information items with reference to the designated attribute and displaying the classified information on a screen of a display unit,” as recited in claim 1. In Olson et al., the hierarchal structural relationships as basic information are “modified” by a user. Consequently, in Olson et al., it is impossible to flexibly classify and promptly display the information items in accordance with the user’s designation of attributes. Therefore, Olson et al. fails to teach or suggest at least the step of “acquiring the plurality of information items from the storage unit, classifying information contained in the acquired plurality of information items with reference to the designated attribute and displaying the classified information on a screen of a display unit,” as recited in claim 1. Applicants respectfully

request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C § 102(b) as being anticipated by Olson et al.

Claims 2, 6, 7, and 12, although of different scope, recite elements similar to that discussed above with regard to claim 1. Applicants therefore request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claims 2, 6, 7, and 12 for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 3-5, 8-10, and 13-15 depend from claims 2, 7, and 12 respectively. As explained, claims 2, 7, and 12 recite elements not disclosed by Olson et al. Accordingly, claims 3-5, 8-10, and 13-15 are allowable over Olson et al. for at least the same reasons as claims 2, 7, and 12. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

### **III. Conclusion**


In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON,  
FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: November 22, 2004

By:   
\_\_\_\_\_  
Milan Kapadia  
Reg. No. 55,982